DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 116 131 95 CS 002 283

AUTHOR	Wurster, Stanley R.; Mathis, P. Austin, Jr.
TITLE	Happiness Is Reading! Reading Resource Center Glendale Elementary School District No. 40. Third Year of a Title I Project.
INSTITUTION	Arizona State Univ., Tempe. Coll. of Education.; Glendale Elementary School District 40, Ariz.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Oct 75
NOTE	38p.; See related documents ED 082 150 and ED 101 274
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	Attendance; *Educationally Disadvantaged; Elementary Education; Parent Attitudes; *Reading Centers; Reading Diagnosis; *Reading Programs; *Remedial Reading; Self Concept; Student Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS	Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; ESEA Title I

ABSTRACT

In 1972 a supportive reading program to improve the reading achievement of educationally disadvantaged students in second, third, and fourth grades was developed and implemented. This report covers the efforts of the third year of the program (the first two years have been reported previously), which also anticipated improvement in self-concept, attitudes toward reading, and attendance. The report discusses the program goals and objectives; the selection of subjects and the identification of disadvantaged children; reading resource centers; the measurement and analysis of reading achievement, self-concept, reading attitude, attendance, and parental reaction; results (tests, records, inventory, and evaluation); and the conclusions and recommendations. Five appendixes contain test results, inventories, and evaluation instruments. Program results show that the Reading Resource Centers have been successful in improving oral reading, reading skills, self-concept, student attitude toward reading, and attendance. (JM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED116131

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

READING RESOURCE CENTER
Glendale Elementary Schools
F. Austin Mathis, Director

a title 1 project

CS 002 283

glenn f. burton, superintendent
glendale elementary school district no. 40

READING RESOURCE CENTER
GLENDALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT #40
THIRD YEAR OF A TITLE I PROJECT

BY

DR. STANLEY R. WORSTER, EVALUATOR
ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

AND

MR. F. AUSTIN MATHIS, JR., DIRECTOR
GLENDALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT #40

GLENDALE, ARIZONA
OCTOBER, 1975

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section		Page
I	Introduction	1
	Goals and Objectives	1
	Definition of Terms	2
II	Program Discription	3
	Selection of Subjects	3
	Identifying Disadvantaged Children	4
	Reading Resource Centers	4
	Reading Achievement Measurement and Analysis	5
	Self Concept Measurement and Analysis	6
	Reading Attitude Measurement and Analysis	7
	Attendance Measurement and Analysis	7
	Parental Reaction Measurement and Analysis	8
III	Results	9
	Slosson Oral Reading Test	9
	Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests	10
	Self Concept Test	13
	Reading Attitude Inventory	14
	Attendance Records	14
	Parent Advisory Council Evaluation (PAC)	15
IV	Conclusions and Recommendations	
	Conclusions	17
	Recommendations	18
Appendix		
	A. Slosson Oral Reading Test Results	19
	B. Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests Results - Total Reading	21

TABLE OF CONTENTS CONTINUED

	Page
C. Reading Attitude Inventory and Instructions	23
D. PAC Cover Letter and Evaluation Instrument	27
PAC Evaluation Instrument Analysis	33
E. Television Actors - Primary Level - Self Concept Inventory	35

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Actual and Predicted Post Test Mean Comparisons	13

Section I

Introduction

As early as 1965 the Glendale Elementary School District #40 became aware of apparent deficiencies in reading achievement among educationally disadvantaged children. In 1972 a supporative reading program was developed and implemented in an effort to improve the reading skills of educationally deprived children within the district. The results of the first two years of the ESEA Title I reading program have been reported previously and appear in ERIC (Research In Education) under documents #ED082150 and #ED101274.

This report represents efforts to report the results of the third year of the supportive reading program as it functioned in the Glendale Elementary School District during the 1974-75 school year.

Goals and Objectives

The basic purpose of this Title I project was to improve the reading achievement of educationally disadvantaged students in grades two, three, and four. Improvement was also anticipated in such areas as self concept, attitudes toward reading, and attendance.

In pursuing the above mentioned goals the following objectives were established:

1. By May 30, 1975, eighty percent of the selected children will make a nine month or more gain in oral reading grade placement as measured by pre-post test results of the Slosson Oral Reading Test.

2. By May 30, 1975, eighty percent of the selected children will show at least a moderate improvement (.9 month gain) in "total reading" as measured by pre-post test results of the Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests.

3. By May 30, 1975, the selected students will show an improvement in self concept as measured by pre-post test results of a self concept measure.

4. By May 30, 1975, the selected students will show an improvement in their attitude toward reading as measured by pre-post test results of a reading attitude inventory.

5. By May 30, 1975, attendance patterns for the selected children will improve during the present school year when compared to the prior school year.

In addition to the above objectives it was hoped that the Parent Advisory Council (PAC) or parents who had students participating in the Reading Resource Centers would have a positive reaction to the Reading Resource Centers as measured by a project developed survey instrument.

Definition of Terms

READING RESOURCE CENTERS: This is the name given the five instructional units formed to provide remedial reading instruction in the Glendale Elementary District. These Reading Centers are classrooms equipped and staffed for the teaching of reading.

EDUCATIONALLY DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN: These are the children from low income families scoring in the 4th stanine or below on selected subtests of the Stanford Achievement Tests. These children are capable of benefitting from instruction and were recommended by their classroom teachers.

Section II

Program Description

In pursuing the objectives established for this project year, standardized tests were administered, responses to an attitude inventory were collected, and prior and present year attendance figures were collected. In addition, parents' reactions to the project were sought. The data collected were analyzed in an effort to evaluate the effectiveness of the project.

Selection of Subjects

Students selected to attend the Reading Resource Centers were selected by means of several criteria.

Scores were used from a district-wide achievement test given in the spring of 1974. The test used was the Stanford Achievement Test.

All students participating in the Reading Resource Centers had to score in the fourth stanine or below on selected subtests of the test and be recommended by their classroom teacher.

To qualify for the program, each of the target students had to have his/her parent's permission to participate. This was in an attempt to involve parents in motivating the children who would participate in the Centers. An attempt was also made to exclude students with disabilities and to deal with those children who were underachievers capable of increasing their reading achievement.

The Reading Resource Center reading specialists played a significant role in the screening and selection of participants during this third year of operation.

A total of 161 children participated in the project. This number included 7 first grade repeaters (4.3%), 73 second graders (45.3%), 56 third graders (34.8%), and 17 fourth graders (10.6%). A total of 8 of these program participants (5.0%) were non-public school students.

The ethnic background of the participants was primarily Spanish surname (62.9%). However, 34.7% of the participants were white, 1.2% was black, and 1.2% were other (oriental and Indian).

Identifying Disadvantaged Children

Based upon the most recent data of the U.S. census bureau (1970), numbers receiving aid for dependent children, and number of foster children, approximately 920 children from low income families were identified. The three schools with the highest percentage (over the district average of 12.20%) were selected as target schools for this ESEA Title I project.

The three schools selected with the highest concentration of children from low-income families were the Harold W. Smith School, Isaac E. Imes School, and the Unit I School.

Using the criteria previously described, 263 educationally deprived children in the second, third, and fourth grades, were selected from the three target schools. A total of 161 children participated in the project.

Reading Resource Centers

Centers were set up as separate but cooperating units with one teacher and one or more educational assistants in each unit. Children attended the center one hour each day in groups of ten or less.

Each teacher had four instructional hours a day, and all instruction was done on an individual basis or in small groups.

Educational Developmental Laboratories (EDL), materials "Listen, Look, and Learn," were used as the central core for the program. Along with this program, use was made of the controlled reader, the look and write program, Tach-x recognition training, the Aud-x for word and skills introduction, and individual and small group reading. Reading Resource Center staff supplemented the EDL program to meet student

needs recognized from previous experiences.

The EDL program was selected to serve as the core of instruction because: A core-system had been found to be advantageous, EDL is adaptable to many different ages and reading needs, EDL could provide individualization in the program, and this program was totally different from the program used in the regular classroom.

The Reading Resource Centers were setup to deal with a child over a period of one year or more with stress placed upon the idea of success each day for the child.

The Reading Resource Centers' program was under the direction of one administrative director, with five reading specialists and seven educational assistants manning the centers. Although each of the five units used the same basic materials, each reflected the personalities of the individuals working there. Widespread use of positive reinforcement was noticeable in each of the five centers.

Reading Achievement Measurement and Analysis

Two different instruments were used to measure reading achievement. Both the Slosson Oral Reading Test (SORT) and the Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests were administered as pre and post test measures.

The SORT is a relatively short test designed specifically and totally for reading. It is individually administered. Three indicators of reading achievement are provided by this test; instructional level, independent level, and frustration level. For purposes of this project only the instructional level (a grade equivalent) was used for evaluation.

The SORT was administered in September, 1974 as a pre test to the target children only. It was again administered in May, 1975 to the target children as a post test.

The Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests were administered as a pre test in September, 1974 and were administered again as a post test in May, 1975. Subtest scores for reading: letter identification, word identification, word attack, word comprehension,

paragraph comprehension, and total reading were recorded and utilized in the final analysis.

For the Slosson Oral Reading Test, analysis was limited to calculated: mean, median, range, and gains. Percentages and frequencies within reading gain classifications for individual grade levels were also calculated and analyzed relative to established objectives.

In an attempt to further evaluate the effectiveness of the Reading Resource Centers, the actual post test Reading achievement scores of the students participating in the Reading Resource Centers were compared with an anticipated post test score based up the child's normal growth pattern. This was done for each of the Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests.

Actual post test scores for the target students were compared to the anticipated post test scores by means of correlated "t tests" to determine if there was any significant difference. All statistical tests were evaluated at the .05 level of significance.

Self-Concept Measurement And Analysis

A new self-concept inventory was selected for this year's project. The inventory, entitled Television Actors-Primary Level, was administered in September, 1974 as a pre test and again in May, 1975 as a post test (see Appendix E).

This inventory asks the respondent to consider television roles which he would be willing to play in a fictitious television show. Eighteen items are presented, some of which would be generally considered aversive, for example, a "dirty-faced child." The respondent's score is computed simply by determining the number of roles he would be willing to play.

This inventory is based upon the assumption that an individual who possesses a positive self concept will be willing to project himself into a wider variety of roles than one who has a less strong self concept. One who is secure in aspects of

his own identity can play a make-believe role without threat.

Since this was a new instrument, no criterion was established as to a desirable score on the 18 item instrument. It was the purpose of this instrument to determine if the participants' self concept increased significantly from pre test to post test. Data was analyzed by means of a correlated t-test ($p \leq .05$).

Reading Attitude Measurement And Analysis

A reading attitude inventory was administered as a pre test and post test to determine the ability of the Reading Resource Centers to alter the target children's attitude toward reading (see Appendix C).

The attitude inventory utilized, subjected to extensive research the previous summer, consisted of twenty statements related to reading. To add uniformity to the test administration, the test was administered by means of a cassette tape to students individually or to groups of students which did not exceed five (5).

Students responded to each of the twenty statements on the inventory by circling yes, maybe, or no. A rating scale ranging from 1 (no) to 3 (yes) was selected to designate attitudes as positive or negative. A score from 1 to 1.67 represented a negative attitude, a score from 1.675 to 2.34 represented an uncertain or neutral attitude, and a score between 2.345 and 3.00 represented a positive attitude.

Means, medians and ranges were calculated for pre and post tests. Also, mean gain from pre to post test was determined. Mean attitude scores on pre and post tests were utilized for evaluation relative to the established objective. A correlated t-test was used to compare pre and post test means ($p \leq .05$).

Attendance Measurement and Analysis

Attendance patterns of children participating in the Reading Resource Centers was examined for the prior school year and the present school year in an effort to determine if attendance patterns changed for these children.

The total possible days of attendance for each school year was 176 days. The number of days a child attended each year was recorded for each child in the target group.

Means, medians, and ranges for days attended during the 1973-74 and 1974-75 school years were calculated as well as the mean gain/loss in days attended. The average number of days attended during these two shcool years was utilized for evaluation of the established objective. A correlated t-test was utilized to compare attendance patterns during the two school years ($p \leq .05$).

Parental Reaction to Reading Resource Centers.

Measurement and Analysis (PAC)

An eighteen item (18) survey instrument was developed by the project evaluator to solicit parental reactions to the Reading Resource Centers (See Appendix D). Parental involvement in evaluation was solicited by means of the Parent Advisory Council (PAC).

Responses to the eighteen items on the survey instrument were tabulated. Frequencies of responses within classifications (e.g. Yes, No, Uncertain) were recorded as well as percentages. Percentages of responses (e.g. Yes) were utilized for evaluation relative to the established objective.

Section III

Results

Various instruments were used and data collected in an effort to obtain meaningful information regarding the effectiveness and impact of the Title I Project - Reading Resource Centers. Used in this evaluation were:

Slosson Oral Reading Test

Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests

a. Letter Identification

b. Word Identification

c. Word Attack

d. Word Comprehension

e. Paragraph Comprehension

f. Total Reading

Self Concept Test

Reading Attitude Inventory

Attendance Records (Previous and Present Years)

PAC Evaluation (Parental)

Slosson Oral Reading Test:

Analysis of the results of the SORT indicates the project was successful in exceeding objective 1 which stated:

> objective 1: By May 30, 1975, eighty percent of the selected children will make an eight month or more gain in reading grade placement as measured by pre-post test results of the SORT.

The average gain (9/74-5/75) in reading achievement for the total group of 161 participants for whom pre and post tests were available, was 1 year 7 months (1.7). Eight (8) students form Our Lady of Perpetual Help realized an average

gain of 1 year 5 months. First grader repeaters (7), of the remaining (153) Glendale Elementary District students, realized an average gain of 1 year 7 months; second graders (73) realized an average of 1 year 8 months; third graders (56), 1 year 6 months; and fourth graders (17), 1 year 6 months.

A sizeable percentage (89.4%) of the project participants made a 9 month or more gain in reading grade level placement, and 91.9% made an 8 month gain in reading grade level placement.

A total of 149 participants averaged 1 month or more gain in Reading Achievement for each month spent in the Reading Resource Centers. The figure represents 92.5% of the participants. A total of 86 participants or 53.4% averaged 2 months or more gain in reading achievements for each month spent in the Centers.

A more detailed break-down of students' average monthly gain per month in the project may be found in appendix A.

Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests:

Results of the Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests indicates the project was successful in exceeding objective 2 which stated:

> objective 2: By May 30, 1975, eighty percent of the selected children will show at least a moderate improvement (.9 month gain) in "total reading" as measured by pre-post test results of the Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests.

The adoption of the individually administered Woodcock Mastery Tests provides additional information form the previous two years. The Woodcock Tests provide information for evaluation in the areas of letter identification, word identification, word attack, word comprehension, paragraph comprehension and total reading.

Data analysis relative to those skills indicated above yielded the following

results:

Letter identification - Average gain was 2 years 5 months

Word identification - Average gain was 8 months

Word attack - Average gain was 1 year 5 months

Word comprehension - Average gain was 9 months

Paragraph comprehension - Average gain was 9 months

Total reading - Average gain was 1 year

Eight (8) students from OLPH realized an average gain of 1 year 1 month on Total reading. First grade repeaters, of the remaining Glendale Elementary District students, realized an average gain of .9 months on Total reading; second graders, .9 month; third graders, 1 year; and fourth graders, 1 year 1 month.

A sizable percentage (82.0%) of the project participants (132) realized a gain of .9 month on total reading achievement for each month spent in the Reading Centers. A total of 122 participants or 75.8% made one (1) month gain for each month spent in the Reading Centers.

A more detailed break-down of student's average monthly gain per month in the project may be found in appendix B.

A somewhat different procedure was utilized this year in an effort to estimate the impact of the Reading Resource Centers on the achievement levels in those reading skill areas previously discussed. An anticipated post test score was calculated for each project participant. This anticipated post test score was based upon the child's normal growth pattern. For example, a student who is in the first month of third grade who pretests at 1.8 grade level (grade equivalent) has really shown a growth of 8 months (most standardized tests start at 1.0) during his two years of school. Thus, he has shown a growth pattern of .4 month growth for each month in school while under the regular classroom program. Since this student would be exposed to the Reading Resource Center reading program for an 8 month period (Sept - May), we would expect

him to show a normal growth pattern of 3.2 months (8 x .4 = 3.2 months). Thus, we would expect his post test performance under a normal growth pattern to be 3 months above the pre test performance level or at 2.1 (1.8 + .3). This represents a predicted or anticipated post test score. The analysis performed was designed to answer the question, "Did the Reading Resource Center reading program produce a significantly different post test performance level than we might have expected under a normal growth pattern?" Also, "To what extent?"

In the areas of letter identification, word identification, word attack, word comprehension, paragraph comprehension, and total reading (all areas tested) the Reading Resource Center reading program produced results significantly better than we might have expected with a normal growth pattern.

The differences between the Reading Resource Center program impact and the normal growth pattern for these children was as follows:

Letter identification - 1 year 8 months

Word identification - 4 months

Word attack - 1 year 1 month

Word comprehension - 6 months

Paragraph comprehension - 5 months

Total reading - 6 months

These differences between the group predicted post test mean and the group actual post test mean was tested for significance with a correlated t-test ($p \leq .05$).

The results of the analysis procedures outlined above are presented in Table I on next page:

TABLE 1

ACTUAL AND PREDICTED POST TEST MEAN COMPARISONS FOR THE WOODCOCK READING MASTERY TESTS FOR TITLE I STUDENTS IN THE GLENDALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT (N = 161)

TEST	POSTTEST MEAN (PREDICTED)	STANDARD DEVIATION	POSTTEST MEAN (ACTUAL)	STANDARD DEVIATION	T - RATIO
LETTER IDENTIFICATION	3.3	1.8	5.1	3.9	6.270**
WORD IDENTIFICATION	2.4	.6	2.8	.8	8.115**
WORD ATTACK	2.3	.8	3.4	1.9	8.565**
WORD COMPREHENSION	2.1	.7	2.7	.8	11.089**
PARAGRAPH COMPREHENSION	2.4	.7	2.9	.8	10.077**
TOTAL READING	2.4	.7	3.0	.8	15.234**

* T - RATIO REQUIRED AT .05 LEVEL WITH 160df = 1.960

** T - RATIO REQUIRED AT .01 LEVEL WITH 160df = 2.576

In all cases the Title I intervention produced results significantly better than we might have expected with a normal growth pattern. These differences were significant beyond the .01 level of significance.

Self Concept Test:

Analysis of the results of the Television Actors self concept inventory indicates the project was successful in reaching objective 3 which stated:

> objective 3: By May 30, 1975, the selected students will show an improvement in their attitude toward reading as measured by pre - post test results of a self concept measure.

A new self concept test was adopted this year. It was felt the test adopted was more appropriate for these children and more sensitive to the measurement of self concept than previously used instruments. There was no criterion established as to a desirable score on the 18 item instrument. It was the purpose of the instrument to determine if the participants' self concept increased significantly from pre test to post test.

Statistical analysis of the test results indicated that the pre test mean was 9.5 and the post test mean was 11.0. This difference was found to be statistically significant beyond the .01 level ($t = 4.764$).

Reading Attitude Inventory

A sizeable percentage (68.9%) of the participants realized a gain in attitude toward reading between pre and post testing. Only 16.8% decreased and 14.3% remained unchanged in reading attitude between pre and post testing. These figures and results of the correlated t-test analysis indicate that the project was successful in reaching objective 4 which stated:

> objective 4: By May 30, 1975, the selected students will show an improvement in their attitude toward reading as measured by pre-post test results of a reading attitude inventory.

In September 1974, the participant's attitude toward reading was found to be uncertain or neutral (2.23). Their attitude at time of post testing (5/75) was found to be positive (2.45), with a gain realized since the pretest.

Statistical analysis of the attitude test results indicated the difference between the pre test and post test was significant beyond the .01 level of significance ($t = 7.732$).

Attendance Records:

Analysis of the attendance records for participants for the school years 1973-74 and 1974-75 indicates the project was successful in reaching objective 5 which stated:

> objective 5: By May 30, 1975, attendance patterns for the selected children will improve during the present school year when compared to the prior school year.

To be included in the evaluation of attendance patterns a student must have attended the total years 1973-74 and 1974-75. There was 148 participants who fulfilled this criterion.

The mean number of days attended by project participants during the 1973-74 school year was 160.9 days. The mean number of days attended by these 148 project participants during the 1975-75 school year was 168.1 days. The average gain in days attended between last year (1973-74) and this year (1974-75) was 7.2 days.

Statistical analysis of the 1973-74 and 1974-75 attendance results indicated that mean number of days attended by project participants during the 1974-75 school year was significantly improved over the 1973-74 school year ($p<.01$ - $t = 6.280$).

In addition to the above objectives data was collected from Parent Advisory Council (PAC) members and parents who had students participating in the Reading Resource Centers in an effort to assess their reactions to the Reading Resource Centers.

Parent Advisory Council Evaluation (PAC)

A total of twenty (20) parents visited the Reading Resource Centers to observe the activities of the centers and to assist in evaluating these centers. This number of parental responses (20), represents a marked increase over the number of parents who visited the centers to observe and assist us in evaluation the previous year.

A total of fourteen of those parents observing in the centers (70%) observed in centers attended by their children. Six (6) observed in centers (30%) which their children did not attend.

All of those parents (100%) completing the evaluation instrument indicated that they felt the Reading Resource Center program was a beneficial program which is fulfilling basic reading needs of children, and should be used to benefit more children.

The overall indication of the responses to the Parent Evaluation Instrument was that parents are pleased with what is happening in the centers and to their children and would like to see the program continued and even extended.

A more detailed analysis of the PAC evaluation instrument may be found in appendix D. A copy of the evaluation instrument and cover letter may also be found in appendix D.

Section IV

Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions

In view of the results, the following conclusions are advanced:

1. The Reading Resource Centers have been successful and contributed towards the improvement of oral reading grade level placement for the target students as measured by the Slosson Oral Reading Test (SORT).
2. Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests Analyses suggest that the Reading Resource Centers have had considerable impact upon target students' reading skills. This impact is evident specifically in the areas of:
    a. Letter identification
    b. Word identification
    c. Word attack
    d. Word comprehension
    e. Paragraph comprehension
    f. Total reading
3. The Title I project contributed to a significant improvement in self concept during the project year.
4. The Reading Resource Centers have contributed to the improvement of target students' attitude toward reading.
5. Attendance patterns of target students have improved during this project year, and the Title I project has contributed to this improved attendance pattern.
6. Parents with children involved in the Reading Resource Center program are pleased with the program and feel the program is a beneficial program which is fulfilling basic reading needs of children, and should be used to benefit more children.

Recommendations

In view of the findings of this report, the following recommendations are offered:

1. It is recommended that the Reading Resource Center program be extended to additional centers as eligibility is established. In this manner more children will receive the benefits of the program.
2. It is recommended that the analysis procedure of comparing actual post test results with anticipated post test results be continued during the next project year.
3. It is recommended that efforts exerted during this project year to involve parents in program evaluation be continued during the next project year.

Appendix A

Students' Average Monthly Gain Per Month In The Project

Slosson Oral Reading Test

(Reported in Grade Equivalent Months or Fractions of Months)

GRADE LEVELS	-.5 or more to -1 month		.0 to .4 month		.5 to .9 month		1.0 to 1.4 month		1.5 to 1.9 month		2.0 or more months		total # students with pre and post test scores
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Repeaters	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	14.3	1	14.3	5	71.4	7
2	0	0.0	1	1.3	5	6.3	10	12.7	16	20.3	47	59.5	79
3	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	3.5	15	26.3	13	22.8	27	47.4	57
4	0	0.0	1	5.6	3	16.7	2	11.1	5	27.8	7	38.9	18
Total	0	0.0	2	1.2	10	6.2	28	17.4	35	21.7	86	53.4	Grand Total 161

Appendix B

STUDENTS' AVERAGE MONTHLY GAIN PER MONTH IN THE PROJECT

WOODCOCK READING MASTERY TEST - TOTAL READING

(Reported in Grade Equivalent Months or Fractions of Months)

LEVELS	-.5 or More to -1 Month		.0 to .4 Month		.5 to .9 Month		1.0 to 1.4 Month		1.5 to 1.9 Month		2.0 or More Months		TOTAL STUDENTS: Total No. Students With Pre and Post Test Scores
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
1													
TERS	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	28.6	5	71.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	7
2	0	0.0	2	2.5	19	24.1	32	40.5	14	17.7	12	15.2	79
3	0	0.0	1	1.8	10	17.5	28	49.1	13	22.8	5	8.8	57
4	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	27.8	5	27.8	3	16.7	5	27.8	18
al	0	0.0	3	1.9	36	22.4	70	43.5	30	18.6	22	13.7	GRAND TOTAL 161

READING ATTITUDE INVENTORY INSTRUCTIONS (ON TAPE)

We are now ready to begin a reading game. All you have to do is answer the questions. There is a person there who will stop the tape recorder if you have a problem. Be sure you understand each thing I say before I go on.

This is a reading game to find out how boys and girls feel about reading. So that you really understand what is meant by feel, let's talk about another kind of feeling. Most boys and girls like to watch t.v.. Some programs you like better than others. How you feel is your attitude.

I want you to be very honest and tell me how you really feel about reading. Don't answer how you think your Mom or Dad or someone else wants you to answer. I want you to tell me how the statement makes you feel inside yourself.

Let's look at the Answer Sheet. There are three ways to mark the answers. You will have to know what they mean, so listen carefully.
Mark "YES" if you agree with the statement.
Mark "NO" if you do not agree with the statement.
Mark "MAYBE" if you do not really know if you agree or if you do not agree.

I will read each example two times. Do not mark an answer until you have heard it both times. Listen to Example A. I like to read. I like to read. Mark an answer. How do you feel about that statement? If you like to read books, you marked YES. If you do not like to read books, you marked NO. If you were unsure, whether you like to read books or do not like to read books, you marked "MAYBE". Do you understand?

Let's try another one. Listen to Example B. You learn more from t.v. than from reading books. You learn more from t.v. than from reading books. Mark an answer. If you think you learn more from t.v. than from reading books, you marked YES. If you think you do <u>not</u> learn more from t.v. than from reading books, you marked NO. If you were not sure whether reading is a better way to spend time or watching t.v. is a better way to spend time, you marked MAYBE. Do you understand?

If you do not understand how to score the answers, the tester will stop the tape and explain again. Remember there are no right or wrong answers. It's just how <u>you</u> feel about it. We are ready to start.

I will read each statement two times. Do not mark your answers until you have heard it both times. Number 1----.

READING ATTITUDE TEST

1. Reading is fun.
2. There is nothing to be learned from reading books.
3. Money spent on books is wasted.
4. Books are boring.
5. Reading is a good way to spend free time.
6. Sharing books is a waste of time.
7. You should only read books if you want to make good grades.
8. Reading is important to me.
9. Books are usually good enough to finish reading.
10. There should be more time for free time reading in school.
11. Reading is for learning but is not for fun.
12. Reading is something I don't need.
13. There are many books which I would like to read.
14. Most books are not interesting.
15. Reading is not a good way to spend free time.
16. You should spend sometime reading during your summer vacation.
17. You don't learn anything reading in your free time.
18. You should read books only in school.
19. Books make good presents or gifts.
20. Reading is something I can use.

Appendix D

PAC Cover Letter and Evaluation Instrument

PAC Evaluation Instrument Analysis

GLENDALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

District No. 40
GLENN F. BURTON, Superintendent
5730 West Myrtle Avenue ✈ Post Office Box 247
Glendale, Arizona 85301

Appendix D

Dear PAC Member:

We sincerely welcome your participation in the Glendale Elementary School District Title I Project, and thank you for taking time to aid us in evaluating our program and Reading Centers.

When you enter the Reading Centers we ask that you observe carefully such things as: Number of adults working with the children, number of children in the center, equipment available and used in the center, activities children are engaged in and materials they use in the center, children's general atmosphere of the center.

At the conclusion of your visit to the center you will receive a form to complete. The form is designed for you to record your observations and any comments you may wish to make.

We have tried to develop the form you will receive with our objectives in mind. You will observe situations which are not covered on the form. Please feel free to ask questions of the adults you find working in the centers as you are completing the form and to add your comments to the form.

Please return the form in the envelope provided or leave the sealed envelope with the Reading Specialist in the center who will mail it directly to the evaluator.

Again, thank you for your assistance.

Dr. Stanley R. Wurster
External Evaluator
Arizona State University

Reading Resource Center

Title I Project

PAC Evaluation

Does your child attend this center? Yes_____ No _____

The goal of our Reading Centers and Title I project is to improve the reading performance for educationally disadvantaged children in grades two, three, and four. Our objectives are designed to attain this goal. Please record your observations and reactions the best you can, and when necessary ask questions of the adults working in the centers.

1. How many adults did you find in the center working with the children? 0_____ 1_____ 2 _____3 _____ more than 3 _____

Comments:

2. Did you find the children working in small groups on different reading skills? Yes_____ No _____ Uncertain_____

Comments:

3. Children in the Centers advance in their reading lessons at their own speed. Do you feel that this is motivation and beneficial to the children? Yes _____ No _____ Uncertain_____

Comments:

Appendix D

4. Did you find that as the children worked on their different reading skills, that the equipment they were using played an important parr in their learning progress? Yes _____ No _____ Uncertain_____

Comments:

5. Do you feel the children were motivated to work on their reading skills by using the equipment found in the Reading Center? Yes _____ No _____ Uncertain _____

Comments:

6. Did you find the children in the center receiving individual attention from the adults in the center? Yes _____ No_____ Uncertain_____

Comments:

7. Did you find that the children were busy during the period while they were in the center. Yes _____ NO _____ Uncertain _____

Comments:

8. Did you find the children using materials which appeared to be aiding the children in their reading skills? Yes_____ No _____ Uncertain_____.

Comments:

Appendix D

9. Did you find that the children enjoyed the various activities in which they were involved? Yes _____ No_____ Uncertain_____

Comments:

10. Did you find the atmosphere of the reading centers friendly, warm, and generally pleasant for the children? Yes _____ No _____ Uncertain _____

Comments:

11. Did you find that the children appear to take pride in their work and accomplishments in the Reading Center? Yes _____ No_____Uncertian_____

Comments:

12. Did you find that the child's success was constantly encouraged by the adults in the Reading Center? Yes_____ No _____ Uncertain_____

Comments:

13. Did you find that the children were eager to ask for help when they needed it? Yes_____No_____Uncertain_____

Comments:

14. Did you find that the adults in the center worked well with the children? Yes _____No_____Uncertain_____

Comments:

15. Did you find that the children knew what their tasks were and when necessary worked at these tasks independently or without being assisted by the adults in the center? Yes_____ No _____Uncertain _____

Comments:

16. Did the children appear to be anxious to come to the center and somewhat reluctant to leave? Yes_____No_____ Uncertain_____

Comments:

17. In general, do you feel that the proceedures and type of student participation found in the Reading Center increases and strengthens student-teacher relationships? Yes_____ No _____ Uncertain _____

Comments:

18. Would you give your overall reaction to the Reading Center by choosing one of the following:

_____(a) A beneficial program which is fulfilling basic reading needs of children, and should be used to benefit more children.

_____(b) A beneficial program which is fulfilling basic reading needs of children, but which should be restricted to a limited number of children with severe reading problems.

_____(c) A program with limited benefits to children in our district, and in need of major revision.

_____(d) A program which offers little or no opportunity for children to improve their basic reading skills, and should be abandoned.

_____(e) Other (Please comment) _

Appendix D

PARENT EVALUATION

A total of twenty (20) parents visited the Reading Resource Centers to observe the activities of the centers and to assist in evaluating these centers. This number of parents, twenty (20), represents a marked contrast when compared to the six parents who actually visited the Reading Resource Centers to observe the activities of the centers and to assist us in evaluation the previous year.

The overall indication of the responses to the Parent evaluation instrument was that these parents were pleased with what they saw happening in the centers and to their children. It was also indicated that what they saw happening greatly enhances the possibility of the project reaching its objectives.

A total of fourteen (14) of these parents observing in the centers (70%) were observing in centers which their children attended. Six (6) observed in centers (30%) which their child did not attend.

Twelve (12) parents (60%) reported that they found three adults in the centers working with children. Seven (7) or 35% reported finding two (2) adults and one (1) or 5% reported finding more than three adults in the centers working with the children.

All twenty (20) respondents (100%) reported that:

2. Children were working in small groups on different reading skills.

3. They felt the children working in their reading lessons at their own speed served as motivation and was beneficial to the children.

4. They found children using equipment which played an important part in their learning progress.

6. They found children receiving individual attention from the adults in the center.

7. They found the children were busy during the period they were in the center.

8. They found children using materials which appeared to be aiding the children in their reading skills.

9. Children enjoyed the various activities in which they were involved.

10. The atmosphere of the reading centers was friendly, warm, and generally pleasant for the children.

15. The children knew what their tasks were and when necessary worked at these tasks independently or without being assisted by the adults in the center.

17. The procedures and type of student participation found in the Reading Center increases and strengthens student - teacher relationships.

18. The Reading Resource Centers is a beneficial program which is fulfilling basic reading needs of children and should be used to benefit more children.

A total of ninteen (19) respondents (95%) reported that:

11. Children appear to take pride in their work and accomplishments in the Reading Center.

12. The child's success was constantly encouraged by adults in the Reading Center. (One parent failed to respond to this item).

13. The children were eager to ask for help when they needed it. (One parent failed to respond to this item).

14. The adults in the center worked well with the children. (One parent failed to respond to this item).

A total of eighteen (18) respondents (90%) reported that they felt the children were motivated to work on their reading skills by using the equipment found in the Reading Center. (Item #5)

A total of sixteen (16) respondents (80%) reported that the children appeared to be anxious to come to the center and somewhat reluctant to leave. The remaining four (4) or 20% were uncertain regarding this item. (Item #16)

Comments written on the evaluation instruments reinforced the indication that parents were generally very pleased with the Reading Resource Center program and felt it should be continued and even extended.

Appendix E

Television Actors

Primary Level

Self Concept Inventory

TELEVISION ACTORS

DIRECTIONS (To be read aloud.) Let's pretend we are going to put on a television show. If you will play the part I ask you, mark "yes" on your answer sheet. If you will not play the part I ask you, mark "no" on your answer sheet. You may play as many parts as you wish.

(Use practice items as needed for class to understand procedure.)

1. Will you play the part of a barnyard animal?
2. Will you play the part of a tree that talks?
3. Will you play the part of an angel?
4. Will you play the part of Batman? (current is 6 Million Dollar Man).
5. Will you play the part of a cry baby?
6. Will you play the part of alonely child?
7. Will you play the part of the Pied Piper?
8. Will you play the part of a forest ranger?
9. Will you play the part of a mushroom?
10. Will you play the part of a worm?
11. Will you play the part of an airplane pilot?
12. Will you play the part of a bunny?
13. Will you play the part of a fireman?
14. Will you play the part of a slow-poke?
15. Will you play the part of a baby?
16. Will you play the part of a policeman?
17. Will you play the part of a hurt child?
18. Will you play the part of a butterfly?